



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,962	12/21/2006	Reinhard Weiberle	10191/4593	2381
26646	7590	12/18/2007		
KENYON & KENYON LLP ONE BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10004			EXAMINER TREAT, WILLIAM M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2181	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

80

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/560,962	WEIBERLE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William M. Treat	2181	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 December 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/14/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2181

1. Claims 29-56 are presented for examination.

2. The drawings are objected to because Figs. 2 and 3 lack meaningful legends. At present, they are nothing more than numbered boxes connected by some lines.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 29-33, 35, 40, 44-46, 48-51, and 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Grochowski et al. (Patent No. 6,615,366).
5. Grochowski taught the invention of exemplary claim 29 including: "a processor system (Fig. 2A), comprising: at least two execution units (110(a), 110(b)); a memory (270); and a switch-over unit for switching between at least two operating modes of the processor system, wherein a transition from a first operating mode to a second operating mode of the processor system is triggered by accessing of a predefined memory address (col. 3, lines 58-67)." The switching unit and switching triggered by accessing of a predefined memory address are described in the embodiment presented at col. 3, lines 64-67.
6. As to claim 30, Grochowski taught: "the processor system as recited in Claim 29, further comprising: a comparator unit (130), wherein the first operating mode corresponds to a safety mode in which the two execution units redundantly process the same program, and the comparator compares statuses of the two execution units resulting from processing of the same program to determine whether the statuses agree (col. 2, lines 45-53).
7. As to claim 31, Grochowski taught: "the processor system as recited in Claim 30, wherein the two execution units synchronously process the same program in the first operating mode (col. 3, lines 58-60).
8. As to claims 32, 33, and 35, they merely say memory is divided in some unspecified way (i.e., logically(?) or physically(?) or by address(?), etc.) and that when operating in safety/HR mode one only wants to be running code from the safety/HR

Art Unit: 2181

region of memory and in the performance/HP mode one wants to be running code from the performance/HR region of memory. Gorchowski taught logical regions/divisions such as operating system kernel, code that operates platform hardware, code for color or location of pixels, and code for values in database fields (col. 3, lines 37-50) which would meet the limitations set forth in claims 32, 33, and 35. Also, for Grochowski's invention to work as described, his system must inherently run, when operating in safety/HR mode, code from the safety/HR region of memory, and in the performance/HP mode, code from the performance/HP region of memory.

9. As to claim 40, Grochowski taught: "the processor system as recited in Claim 30, wherein the comparator is switched off in response to the transition into the second operating mode, and wherein the second operating mode is a performance mode, and wherein a comparison of the statuses of the two execution units takes place only in the first operating mode" (col. 2, lines 45-47).

10. As to claims 44-46, 48-51, and 53, they fail to teach or define over rejected claims 29-33, 35, and 40.

11. As to claims 54 and 55, these are merely claims saying that some aspect of the system monitors whether HR code is being incorrectly run when HP code is being run. Inherently, this is being done in Grochowski's system or the purpose of the two modes would be voided.

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14. Claims 34, 36-39, 41-43, 47, 52, and 56 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grochowski et al. (Patent No. 6,615,366).

15. The examiner takes Official Notice of the fact that in claims 34, 36, 41-43, 52, and 56 applicants are merely using conventional techniques related to change-of-flow instructions and concepts used with forms of memory such as protected memory and user memory.

16. Grochowski makes clear that transitioning from safety/HR mode to performance/HP mode and vice versa requires significant housekeeping operations (col. 4, lines 62-67) which must be undertaken and completed before a given mode is fully operational. In the case of transition from performance/HP mode to safety/HR mode applicants are using an interrupt as might occur when a driver hits the brakes in a panic stop and requires immediate activation of the anti-lock braking system (ABS). Using interrupts to transition a system from user mode to supervisory mode (the

Art Unit: 2181

supervisory mode being where tasks critical to the basic computer system are performed) is a conventional technique in the art. Housekeeping related to the transition is done in conjunction with the change of flow, too. Depending on processor design, interrupts can be directly executed in hardware and can also be prioritized which makes them excellent choices for the transition from performance/HP mode to safety/HR mode when critical tasks are involved.

17. On the return to performance/HP mode from safety/HR mode it is unclear from applicants' disclosure whether applicants use a return instruction or some other form of change of flow instruction but the techniques are familiar. As with a return from an interrupt, there will be housekeeping tasks. Applicants' system must either recognize the address of the instruction to be executed as that of a change of flow instruction which returns to the performance/HP mode or must examine the address to which the change of flow instruction is redirecting the processor in order to be sure proper housekeeping is done. This is the same type of check necessary when transitioning from supervisory mode to user mode after an interrupt (i.e., the system must know when to restore the program state for the interrupted program, where to resume execution of and fetching of instructions, etc.). Modern processors prefetch their instructions and instruction operands, too, because of the disparity between processor and memory speeds allowing for lookahead examination of addresses of instructions and of their operands. This prevents a prolonged stall when something as complex as a transition from one mode of operation to another is performed.

Art Unit: 2181

18. Applicants' use of interrupts, change of flow instructions, and lookahead recognition of addresses to transition from one mode to another merely represents the application of known techniques in the art to bring about expected results. For the reasons stated claims 34, 36, 41-43, 52, and 56 are rejected.

19. As to claims 37-38, Grochowski inherently taught some aspect of his system prevented the execution cores which are operating synchronously from erroneously executing code other than safety/HR code while in safety/HR mode or his invention would not work as described in his patent. By the same token, Grochowski inherently taught some aspect of his system prevented the execution cores which are operating asynchronously from erroneously executing code other than performance/HP code while in performance/HP mode or his invention would not work as described in his patent. However, Grochowski did not teach a switch-over unit assigned to the monitoring of this function. But, Grochowski did teach an embodiment with hardware devoted to switching the processor between modes based on memory area which inherently means a memory address or memory addresses. The examiner takes Official Notice, too, that a conventional way to monitor addresses is by comparators. Since Grochowski's switching hardware unit would be monitoring addresses and/or address lines accessed by the two processors, it would be logical that the system component which monitors addresses which cause a transition from one mode to another could also be used to make certain one or more of the processors did not stray outside the code boundaries of the particular mode.

20. As to claim 47, providing redundant storage of the safety critical program can mean better survivability of the system given some form of catastrophic failure of a portion of memory and can reduce memory contention given sufficient ports and bus lines, but as pointed out in applicants' specification, error correction code is another design option which can save on cost of memory, bus lines, etc.

21. As to claim 39, having separate memory modules for the one version of the performance/HP code and the two copies of the safety/HR code is a design choice which promotes system survivability and potentially reduces resource contention while adding additional hardware cost for redundancy in memory, busses, control structures, etc. Logically, it is a valid design choice one of ordinary skill could readily recognize and implement.

22. The examiner would note that since the KSR decision by the Supreme Court examiners are asked by the Office to require applicants to provide persuasive evidence and/or persuasive arguments, etc. which clearly contradict the examiner's Official Notice before the examiner provides a reference supporting his position.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to William M. Treat at telephone number (571) 272-4175.


24. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Application/Control Number: 10/560,962

Page 9

Art Unit: 2181

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'W. M. Treat', with a horizontal line extending from the end.

**WILLIAM M. TREAT
PRIMARY EXAMINER**